

From: [Jon T. Haugen](#)
To: [Draft EIS Feedback;](#)
CC: [jonthaugen@msn.com;](mailto:jonthaugen@msn.com)
Subject: *** Detected as Spam *** Senate, 10MAY08, Public Comment, Columbia River Crossing
Date: Saturday, May 10, 2008 12:01:56 PM
Attachments:

Saturday, 10 May 2008



DraftEISfeedback@columbiarivercrossing.org

Columbia River Crossing
700 Washington Street, Suite 300
Vancouver, WA 98660
360-737-2725; 1-866-396-2726
Fax: 360-737-0294

Hello,

Columbia River Crossing I have several questions.

1. Under Alternative 4 and 5 why will the existing bridges be re-stripped decreasing travel lanes from six total lanes to four total lanes?
 - a. What is the congestion hours if current stripping remains with six total lanes? (Re-stripping, four total lanes, hours of congestion 10.75 hours per day.)
2. Will I-5 be widened on any of the plans before or after the river? If yes how much wider will I-5 be and for how many miles on each side of the Columbia river (not including dedicated bus lanes)?
3. The exclusive bus lanes extend 2.07-4.22 miles north of the Expo Center. Why the difference from 2.07 to 4.22? What determines whether these lanes will be 2.07 miles or 4.22 miles?
4. Why the difference in buses and light rail required units between supplemental and replacement bridges?

Supplemental: Buses: 38, 60 foot buses, 143 standard buses; Light Rail: 18

rail cars, 147 standard buses.

Replacement: Buses: 27, 60 foot buses, 12 standard buses; Light Rail: 14 rail cars, 27 standard buses.

5. S-Curve effect on river traffic. Current rail bridge built in 1908. Has consideration been given to replacing the rail bridge to eliminate S-Curve effect on river navigation?

Thank you.

Jon Haugen
13502 NW 49th Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98685
360-907-8340
18th LD Senate candidate
www.HaugenSenate.com

Letter to the Editor, The Columbian
Friday, 9 May 2008

Columbia River Crossing DEIS

I have read the Columbia River Crossing Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Seems three years and \$80 million dollars ago the planners were told to produce a document to support spending \$4.1 Billion to replace six lanes of traffic with six lanes of traffic plus light rail. That document has been produced.

Fatal flaws: 1. Replacement of the BNSF Rail Bridge, built in 1908, was not considered. Because of this oversight the Supplemental Bridge options are specious. 2. Supplemental Bridge: leaving current I-5 bridges but re-stripping six lanes of traffic to four lanes of traffic invalidates any meaningful traffic reduction comparisons.

I have testified and advocate building an eight mile elevated highway between SR-500 in Vancouver and I-84 in Portland. This expressway with four lanes would relieve I-5 congestion by adding 66% more lanes.

No light rail. At \$250 million per mile, serving only downtown Vancouver, it is too expensive and too limited.

I have testified and advocate using heavy rail not light rail. A third rail line from Kelso to Portland with stops in Kalama, Woodland, Ridgefield and Vancouver. Replace the Columbia rail bridge with a new three rail pair bridge. This idea would increase commerce. On existing rails: a route from Washougal and Camas to Vancouver and Portland; a route from Battle Ground to Vancouver and Portland.

Jon Haugen

13502 NW 49th Ave.

Vancouver, WA 98685

360-907-8340

www.HaugenSenate.com